



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/954,789	09/12/2001	Charlie Ricci	018413-378	8809

7590 10/22/2002

Robert E. Krebs
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

SHARAREH, SHAHNAM J

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Offic Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/954,789	RICCI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Shahnam Sharareh	1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 16 and 20-29 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 16, 20-29 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment filed on July 15, 2002 has been entered. Claims 16, 20-29 are now pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 15, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 16, 20-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Evans et al US Patent 5,702,361.

In response to applicant's argument that Evans does not teach the use of stents for endovasular prosthesis Examiner states that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Furthermore, it has been held that the recitation that an element is "sufficient" or "adapted to" perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. Accordingly, such limitations are do not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchinson*, 69 USPQ 138. Similarly, the instant limitation of

"capable of inhibiting blood flow" is viewed to only require the stent of Evans to perform such function, and thus, it does not constitute a limitation in a patentable sense. Accordingly, the rejection is proper.

Claims 16, 20-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanabe et al US Patent 5,443,454 (Tanabe) in view of Engelson and Evans et al US Patent 5,695,480.

Applicant argues that Tanabe's compositions require exposure to light before hardening. In response, Examiner states that applicant appears to argue such limitations that are not present within the instant pending claims. Thus, the arguments are not commensurate with the scope of the pending claims. The recitations of the instant claims does not exclude such polymeric compositions that require light before hardening.

Tanabe teaches embolectomy catheters for introduction of a liquid substance (abstract). Tanabe also teaches methods of using such catheter wherein a liquid substance is administered through the catheter into an aneurysm sack wherein the liquid solidifies (see col 11, lines 13-67; col 13, lines 44-60; col 14, lines 6-35). Tanabe further teaches the catheter for embolectomy can also be used in prosthesis methods in lumen (see col 5, lines 60-67). Accordingly, Tanabe teaches all components of the instant claims. Tanabe, however, does not explicitly teach a kit for practicing embolectomy containing a prosthesis.

Engelson provides such teachings for emblotherapeutic methods. (see col 8, lines 10-67; col 10, lines 20-49). Engelson does not specifically teach embolizing compositions that solidify upon contact with blood.

Evans is then used to show typical embolic composition that are used for treating aneurysm. (see col 4, lines 19-35; claims 31-46).

The fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). Accordingly, in the instant case, all elements of the pending claims are taught in the cited references, thus, even though Tanabe uses different compositions as Evans, it would have been well within the level of an ordinary skill in the art to prepare a surgical kits in order to ease accessibility to surgical components in a clinical setting.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shahnam Sharareh whose telephone number is 703-306-5400. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan, PhD can be reached on 703-308-1877. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4556 for regular communications and 703-308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1123.


RUSSELL TRAVERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200

ss
October 21, 2002